



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,725	12/04/2001	Narayan Venkatasubramanyan	020431.0884	1188
53184	7590	06/04/2009	EXAMINER	
i2 TECHNOLOGIES US, INC. ONE i2 PLACE, 11701 LUNA ROAD DALLAS, TX 75234			BOSWELL, BETH V	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3623		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		06/04/2009	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

***Advisory Action***

1. The following is in response to after final communications received 5/22/09.
  
2. Applicant's arguments with regards to Kennedy et al. (U.S. 6,047,290) in view of Weber et al. (U.S. 2002/0156663) have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Weber is not valid prior art because its provisional application does not properly support the subject matter relied upon by examiner. However, Applicant merely alleges that Weber does not provide support in its provisional for 60/218640 because Applicant does not specifically points out the supposed errors in the examiner's action (i.e. what specific aspect of Weber is not supported by the Weber provisional). These arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a mere broad allegation that the Examiner's action is in error, without specifically pointing out the supposed error in the examiner's action.

Examiner is not asking for Applicant to provide facts or support to show that the provisional supports of the non-provisional of Weber (see page 18 of arguments). However, Applicant must point out the specific error in Examiner's action and specifically identify what aspect of the Weber non-provisional is not supported by the Weber provisional. Since Examiner has satisfied her initial burden, and since Applicant has not specifically pointed out the supposed deficiencies in her action, Applicant's allegation that Weber is not valid prior art is unpersuasive.

Further, Applicant arguments with regards to the Kennedy et al. reference and the Weber et al. reference are substantially similar to those raised and addressed in the Final Office action dated 03/24/2009.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Beth V. Boswell at telephone number (571)272-6737.

/Beth V. Boswell/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623